UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED
JIRI PIK,	DOC #:
Plaintiff,	09 Civ. 972 (CM)
against	·.
GOLDMAN SACHS GROUP, GOLDMAN SACHS SERVICES, and JOHN DOES 1-10	
Defendants.	x

ORDER DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S CASE

McMahon, J.:

Pro se plaintiff, Jiri Pik, commenced this lawsuit against his former employer, Goldman Sachs, by filing a summons and complaint on February 4, 2009 (date entered February 19, 2009). When he filed the lawsuit, plaintiff resided in London, England. Since the inception of this action, Mr. Pik has requested numerous postponements of court-scheduled conferences, which the Court has granted each time. Plaintiffs' reasons for adjournment include his failure to effect service on the defendants. At one point in time, he claimed he could not appear because he was detained in an English hospital on "political charges."

The 120 day period for serving process expired on June 19, 2009. On June 19, 2009, the Court granted plaintiff a forty-five day extension to effect service, which gave him until August 3, 2009. The Court warned plaintiff that if he did not effectuate service by that date, it would *sua sponte* dismiss the case without prejudice.

On July 30, 2009, plaintiff asked for yet another extension. The Court granted plaintiff an additional 30 day extension to effect service, which gave plaintiff until September 2, 2009. This extension was conditioned on plaintiff's filing proof that he had couriered summonses to the United States Marshall; no such proof was ever filed.

The Court set a rescheduled Rule 16 conference for today. Late yesterday, the Court received a fax from plaintiff. It said: "I'm requesting the [sic] today's hearing to be postponed as a result of political imprisonment, move/asylum/exile from the EU & distress." Clearly, plaintiff is not prepared to abide by the Court's orders, comport with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or take affirmative steps to prosecute his case.

Plaintiff's time to effect service has expired.

Accordingly, the Court dismisses plaintiff's case for failure to prosecute the case.

This constitutes the decision and order of the Court.

Dated: September 18, 2009

Gille Mr. Mol

BY FIRST CLASS MAIL TO PLAINTIFF

Jiri Pik 145-157st. 2nd Floor John Street London, EC1V 4PY UK PRO SE

BY ECF TO DEFENDANTS